DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 913 UD 025 550

AUTHOR	Lichter, Linda S.; Lichter, S. Robert
TITLE	Howard Beach Youth: A Study of Racial and Ethnic Attitudes.
INSTITUTION	Center for Media and Public Affairs, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	American Jewish Committee, New York, N.Y. Inst. on Pluralism and Group Identity.; National Italian American Foundation, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	May 87
NOTE	36p.; Also sponsored by the Commission for Social Justice, Order of the Sons of Italy.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Media and Public Affairs, 2101 L Street, N.W. #505, Washington, DC 20037.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Attitudes; *Ethnic Bias; High Schools; *High School Students; *Intergroup Relations; Minority Groups; *Racial Relations; Social Problems; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New York (Queens)

ABSTRACT

This assessment of the climate of racial and ethnic attitudes in Howard Beach (New York) was conducted at John Adams High School, the public school attended by the greatest number of high school children in the Howard Beach community. The survey of 1,217 students was administered in December, 1986, several weeks before the incident in which a number of Blacks were beaten and one died in Howard Beach. Results of the survey revealed a significant amount of racial and ethnic tolerance as well as tensions. Large majorities of all White groups reported that neither they nor their parents discouraged contacts with non-Whites. While students report a high perception of tolerance in their home environment, in school many students perceived the existence of racial and ethnic problems. The schools' three largest minority groups--Italians, Blacks, and Hispanics--elicited the highest rates of negative stereotyping. Findings demonstrated the complexity of prejudice. There was no consistent pattern of racial cleavage. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

5-19-89

ED287913

HOWARD BEACH YOUTH: A STUDY OF RACIAL AND ETHNIC ATTITUDES

Dr. Linda S. Lichter
Dr. S. Robert Lichter
Co-directors, The Center for Media and Public Affairs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Lichter
Ctr. for Media & Public Affairs
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This study was sponsored and funded by the American Jewish Committee's Institute for American Pluralism, the National Italian American Foundation's Media Institute and the Commission for Social Justice, Order of the Sons of Italy.

UD025330

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Linda S. Lichter, Ph.D is a former senior research associate at the Research Institute on International Change at Columbia University. S. Robert Lichter, Ph.D holds the DeWitt Wallace chair in communications at the American Enterprise Institute and a research professorship in political science at George Washington University. The Lichters are co-directors of the Center for Media and Public Affairs in Washington, D.C. Their most recent book is The Media Elite America's New Power Brokers.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A October 1986 survey of 1,217 students at John Adams High School, in the Howard Beach section of Queens, revealed a significant amount of racial and ethnic tolerance as well as tensions. The sample contains substantial proportions of black, Hispanic, and Italian American students, and smaller numbers of Jewish, Irish, and Asian Americans. Notably, students' attitudes did not consistently divide along racial lines. Major findings include:

* Most members of all racial and ethnic groups are willing to invite people from other groups into their homes.

* Images of larger groups (Italians, Blacks, and Hispanics) are more negative than those of the smaller groups (Asians, Irish, and Jews).

* Negative feelings toward Italian Americans are balanced by positive ones.

* Blacks are stereotyped as violent and criminal by majorities of all groups, including Blacks themselves.

* Blacks and Hispanics showed the highest tolerance levels in their willingness to associate with all other groups.

* Large pluralities of all groups say there have been racial and ethnic tensions at school.

* Asian students are most likely to have reported discrimination, followed by Jews and Blacks.

* Jewish students voiced the highest tolerance levels of all white groups.

* Italian and Irish Americans are the only groups to endorse the melting pot concept of assimilation.

The survey uncovered higher levels of expressed tolerance and lower levels of negative stereotyping than might have been expected. These findings do not excuse any incident of prejudice or racial violence. But they do not support the notion that racial or ethnic intolerance is pervasive in the social environment of Howard Beach adolescents. The finding that the largest groups elicit the most negative feelings is particularly striking. It suggests the importance of an "ethnic presence" factor transcending racial divisions.

Until recently Howard Beach was known only as one of many New York City neighborhoods. Today the name evokes images of racial strife because of the violent incident in which several Blacks were beaten, and one died. This incident, combined with other recent incidents of racial unrest, have caused some to question whether there is a revival of racism in America.

To address this question, one must look beyond any particular racial incident to the environment in which it occurs. In the case of Howard Beach, it is relevant to assess the climate of racial and ethnic attitudes in the local high school. We conducted this study at John Adams High School, the public school attended by the greatest number of high school children in the Howard Beach community.

The survey was commissioned in the Spring of 1986 and administered in December 1986, several weeks before the incident in Howard Beach.

This was undertaken as a pilot project to examine racial and ethnic attitudes among students in large urban areas. John Adams was chosen because it contains a multiethnic mix characteristic of New York City.

No survey can reveal the entire makeup of racial and ethnic feelings at a school, let alone an entire community. However, our survey can serve as an environmental snapshot that may help us understand the difficulties and complexities encountered when various racial and ethnic groups live and work together.

Like many surveys, this one raises more questions than it answers. Yet the survey does indicate that racial incidents, such as Howard Beach, do not automatically prove that the communities where they occur harbor widespread racism. Without solid evidence, this leap in logic cannot be justified. Conversely, even if the Howard Beach incident had not occurred, one could not logically assume that Howard Beach or any other community was devoid of racism, since the presence of intolerance does not necessarily lead to violence. We must also emphasize that the results of this survey do not and should not exonerate any incident of ethnic prejudice or racial violence.

Methodology

1,217 students at John Adams were questioned on a variety of racial and ethnic issues. The survey was distributed to randomly assigned classrooms, representing about half the entire student body. A pretest

was conducted among 100 students in three New York City schools to insure that the questions were understandable and not offensive to respondents.

In addition to asking questions about one's own ethnicity and social background, the survey probed attitudes toward other ethnic groups. These questions were drawn from sources such as Roper and Los Angeles Times polls and American Psychological Association publications. A separate section of the questionnaire deals with television viewing habits and ethnic portrayals in TV entertainment. (This section is not discussed here; it will be the subject of a later report).

Since our primary concern was to understand how students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds perceive and deal with one another, we assigned students to one of six background categories: Asian, Black, Hispanic, Jewish, Irish and Italian. These groupings were determined from the students' reports of their parents' ethnicity. When the parents differed, the student was assigned to the group he or she felt closest to. On this basis 1,093 students could be assigned to one of the six major ethnic/social groupings or a residual category of "other" whites. (The remainder were unsure of their parents' ethnicity or failed to answer the question.) The respondents who answered were distributed as follows: 3 percent Asian, 29 percent Black, 20 percent Hispanic, 5 percent Jewish, 23 percent Italian, 4 percent Irish, 16 percent other.

KEY FINDINGS

Contact Among Groups

The willingness to associate with members of other groups is a key indicator of tolerance. Therefore, we asked the students to name any groups they would prefer not to have as guests in their homes. Overall, students reported high degrees of tolerance on this measure, as table 1 indicates. More than two-thirds of every racial and ethnic group were willing to associate with those from other groups.

The resistance we did find does not attest to a simple black-white gap. Students of Irish descent were the least willing to associate with nonwhite minority groups. However, over two out of three Irish American students stated a willingness to invite Black, Hispanic, or Asian Americans into their home.

Italian Americans were slightly more willing to accept Black guests, with 71 percent responding positively. This tolerance level rose to 79 percent with regard to Asian guests and 82 percent for

Hispanics. Jewish students voiced the highest tolerance levels of all white groups. Eighty-eight percent would accept Blacks or Hispanics as guests, and 84 percent asserted their openness to Asian guests.

Expressions of contact avoidance were even lower among nonwhite groups. Levels of tolerance among Blacks and Hispanics exceeded 90 percent with regard to all groups. Asians displayed mostly similar tolerance levels, although a slightly lower proportion (83 percent) were willing to invite Blacks home.

Any expression of contact avoidance is certainly grounds for concern. Nonetheless, on the basis of these responses, it appears that large majorities of all white groups do not discourage contact with nonwhites. The converse is also true, with all nonwhite groups open to association with every white ethnic group.

Of course, it is possible that actual feelings of contact avoidance are stronger than those students were willing to report in a survey. Although this possibility cannot be ruled out, another pattern of findings argues against it. It is very common in survey research for people to attribute to others, opinions or reactions that they do not wish to voice themselves. In this survey, however, the opposite occurred.

We asked students what groups their parents wished them to avoid. They attributed somewhat higher tolerance to their parents than to

themselves. We must note that such opinions only reflect students' perceptions of their parents. These perceptions may or may not be accurate. Still, the levels of perceived parental tolerance are impressive.

A Table 2 shows, less than one-quarter of any group perceive their parents as discouraging contact with members of any other group. We also found that Black and Hispanic parents are the least likely to discourage contact with other ethnic groups. By contrast, these two groups are most likely to discourage their children from contact with friends of their own ethnicity. Even in this case, however, such views are held by fewer than one in ten parents.

Interestingly, the parents who are portrayed as the least favorable to contact with non-whites are not white ethnics but Asian-Americans. Even so, 77% did not discourage contact with Hispanics and 83% did not disapprove of befriending Blacks. The students of Irish ancestry report similar patterns of parental cues regarding non-whites.

Among all groups, Jews rank their parents as most open across the board to having friends from other racial and ethnic groups. Parental avoidance is rated highest toward Blacks, but that attitude represents only 8% of Jewish parents. That figure is 1% lower than the proportion of Black parents who discourage contact with other Black children.

Overall, students perceive their parents as least favorable toward

Blacks. However, this intolerance extends to only one parent in eight (13%). With regard to all other ethnic groups, the level of perceived parental avoidance is below 10%.

In conclusion, relatively few students see their parents as restricting their contact with other groups. The strongest perceived resistance is by Asian American parents toward Hispanics and by Italian American parents toward Blacks. In both cases, parental intolerance is reported by just under one-quarter (23 percent) of the students.

The School: Students' Perceptions

As indicated, an impressive amount of tolerance for associating with different ethnic and racial groups is reported among both parents and students. But home environment is only half the equation. To understand the dynamics of students' social environment, we must also examine the atmosphere at their school.

As Table three indicates, perceptions diverge sharply on relations among the various ethnic groups at John Adams High School. About half of all Jews, Blacks and Hispanics say that students from different ethnic groups regularly associate between classes and after school. Conversely, students of Italian and Irish ancestry are more likely to say that the different groups tend to stick to themselves. Those of Asian background fall between these two extremes, with 35 percent saying the different groups mingle. (We should note that a considerable

portion of each group gives an "unsure" reply, ranging from 47 percent for Asians to 24 percent for Jews.)

There are also varying opinions about whether there has been trouble or bad feelings between different ethnic groups at school in the past year or two. Still, large pluralities of all groups say trouble has occurred, as indicated in Table four. The survey results do not address, however, whether these problems are widespread or are caused by a few individuals. The white ethnic groups are most likely to see trouble, by margins of 60 percent and up. Only among Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians do fewer than half perceive recent problems. Thus, there can be little doubt that Adams has recently experienced problems of inter-group relations. This is a question school officials must address. For school officials (or anyone else) to probe such issues, they must inevitably confront whatever racial and ethnic stereotypes exist.

Stereotyping

Negative stereotypes are a major component of ethnic or racial prejudice. At the same time, one may admire certain racial and ethnic groups, precisely because they exhibit certain traits viewed as positive. Thus, stereotyping is a two-way street. In order to probe both the negative and positive images ethnic groups have for one another, we worked with twenty-four adjectives ranging from positive descriptions such as "friendly," "honest," and "kind," to the most negative images such as "violent," "criminal, "loud," and "pushy." Students were asked

to indicate whether each term described "most people" in each of six ethnic groups. Italians, Jews, Irish, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks.

In general, when students characterize groups in either positive or negative terms, they tend to focus on the same clusters of adjectives. These clusters were identified by the statistical technique of factor analysis. The most important adjectives that contribute to a positive image for all groups are: "friendly," "honest," "polite," "hardworking," "smart," "kind," and "emotional." A few additional terms, such as "religious" and "family-oriented," contribute to the positive image of some groups but not others. The negative dimension for all groups prominently includes the terms "lazy," "snobbish," "stupid," and "selfish." Additional descriptives such as "heavy drinker" and "violent" are applicable to the negative images of some groups but not others. A complete list of descriptors is provided in Figure 1.

It is important to note that these two dimensions are statistically independent. This means that the students' tendencies to assign positive and negative characteristics to various groups are separate and distinct judgments, not just opposite sides of the same coin. In other words, positive and negative stereotyping appear to operate independently of one another.

Finally, a secondary dimension emerged among descriptions applied Blacks and Hispanics only. These descriptions seem to reflect perceptions of an aggressiveness dimension, based on the positive and negative

dimensions already delineated. For Hispanics, they include "violent," "criminal," "loud," and "pushy." For Blacks, a similar dimension includes "violent," "criminal," "loud," and "athletic," as well as "musical." All but the last term carry aggressive or assertive connotations.

To measure each of these group images, we added together each student's scores for all adjectives listed in Figure 1 and then divided the total by the number of adjectives listed. The result gives the average percentage of students willing to describe a group in terms of positive, negative, or aggressive descriptions.

Negative Images

The single most striking finding is that images of the three largest groups--Italians, Blacks, and Hispanics--are much more negative than those of the smaller groups, Jews, Asians, and Irish. In fact, as Table five demonstrates, students are about twice as likely to apply negative terms to the former groups. Blacks receive the highest negative ratings by other groups (35 percent of non-Blacks), followed by Italians (32 percent of other groups), and Hispanics (29 percent).

Ratings of the three largest groups are also those most likely to vary between groups. Even in these instances, the differences are not very great. For example, the highest negative rating of one group by another is the 41 percent of Italians who rate Blacks negatively. This

is only 6 percent above the mean negative rating of Blacks by all non-Black students and only 10 percent above the 31 percent rate recorded among Blacks themselves.

These findings suggest that negative stereotypes at Adams cannot be explained primarily in terms of racism. The virtually equivalent negative images of one white and two non-white groups may be related in part to their significant ethnic presence at this school. Because these groups are such large and distinctive parts of the student body, they may be viewed as threatening or unduly dominant by nonmembers. Members of other groups may express their fear or resentment in terms of the negative stereotypes measured. It is also possible that the ethnic presence factor allows members of these large groups to reinforce each other's behavior--positive or negative--thus establishing some factual basis for the stereotype.

In general, negative ethnic ratings do not correspond to broader patterns based on racial differences. For example, Irish students are tied with Hispanics as the group holding the least negative ratings of Blacks (29%), lower than the negative rating recorded among Blacks themselves. Similarly, the six percent of Asians who rate Jews negatively is substantially lower than the 16 percent recorded among Jews themselves, a rate very similar to that found among all other white and nonwhite groups.

While noting the complexity of this pattern of findings, we once

again emphasize that only a minority in each group ascribes negative traits to other groups. Thus, overt ethnic and racial prejudice are by no means a dominant expression of sentiment at this school.

Positive Images

Positive group ratings reflect more ethnic diversity than negative ratings, as indicated in Table 6. Each group's overall positive rating varies substantially according to the ethnic background of those doing the rating. The most intriguing finding is that students of Italian background, who inspire some of the heaviest criticism from their peers, also receive the most praise of any group (36 percent overall positive rating). By contrast, Blacks and Hispanics, who are rated high in negative imagery, are seen to be low in positive imagery.

This finding illustrated the importance of the aforementioned independence of negative and positive stereotypes. Negative feelings toward Italian Americans are balanced by positive ones, whereas this "redeeming stereotype" seems less frequently applied to nonwhites. The clearest example of this pattern is found among the responses of Jewish students. They are the group with the highest proportion of <u>both</u> negative and positive feelings about Italians (39 percent negative versus 44 percent positive).

Once again, ethnic images cannot be reduced to a white versus nonwhite dichotomy. Irish American students give their lowest positive

ratings to Blacks and Hispanics (10 and 14 percent, respectively), but Asian Americans are just as critical of these nonwhite groups. Students of Italian heritage are below average in their positive ratings of all nonwhite groups, but they are slightly more positive toward Blacks and Hispanics than are Asians. And the third white ethnic group in the sample, Jews, attribute greater than average positive traits to both Blacks and Hispanics.

Images of Aggressiveness

We have previously mentioned that Blacks and Hispanics are distinguished from other groups by a dimension of perceived aggressiveness. For the other ethnic groups, this dimension was subsumed within a more general negative stereotype. Although this finding might seem to suggest the influence of racism, the data in Table 7 belie such a simple interpretation.

Black students themselves are about as likely as their peers of Italian and Irish background to rate Blacks as aggressive. The highest rating (68 percent) comes from Jewish students, who are also above average (and highest among white ethnic groups) in their positive images of Blacks. The uniformity of group ratings on this dimension is notable. Apart from Jewish students, no group deviates from the overall mean by more than two percent. (This excludes the residual category of "other" whites, who are slightly less likely than any ethnic or racial group to rate Blacks as aggressive.)

The high levels of agreement with the dimensions are also striking --an overall average of 60 percent. For example, 56 percent of black students apply the adjective "violent" to Blacks. The proportion willing to apply the adjective "criminal" to members of their own race rises to 60 percent. (Among the total sample, 62 percent rate Blacks as "violent," and 64 percent as "criminal.")

Hispanics follow the same overall pattern, except that their aggressiveness rating is lower than that ascribed to Blacks, an average of 47 percent across all groups. Like Blacks, Hispanics are almost as likely to apply this label to themselves as are other groups.

The willingness of so many students to use these negative terms in describing other groups (and even their own ethnic or racial group) once again suggests that they are not holding back or masking their true feelings out of fear of giving offense. On the contrary, it may be that adolescents in a setting of ethnic diversity and some tension are more than willing to vent their negative feelings toward competitors for social influence.

A final word about the application of stereotypes: We can never assume on the sole basis of survey questions that the application of any given trait to an ethnic group necessarily measures either direct hostility or admiration toward that group. One way of looking at stereotypes is to see them as reactions to a particular kind of behavior. For example, an individual may dislike someone he thinks is

"pushy," whatever that person's ethnic origins. Thus, the person reacts primarily to the behavior rather than ethnic or racial origin. If this phenomenon is the case, then it may offer hope for better intergroup relations. One cannot change his or her racial or ethnic origin, but human behavior is fluctuant, if not elastic. This possibility also highlights the importance of perception in judging how other ethnic groups or how one's own group is treated. One key measure of this dimension is whether people perceive themselves as victims of discrimination.

Perceived Discrimination

We asked students if they had ever experienced discrimination because of their race or ethnicity. On average, as Table 8 illustrates, one in three said they were victims of discrimination. Perceptions of discrimination varied independently of race. Asian Americans are most likely to report discrimination (56 percent), followed by Jews (46 percent). Forty-five percent of Blacks and 37 percent of Hispanics say they have been the victims of racial bias. Italian and Irish Americans are least likely to report discrimination (20 percent and 18 percent, respectively). We should remember that different groups may have different definitions of discrimination and, of course, these definitions may vary among members of the same group. Even allowing for such differences, these results suggest that perceptions of discrimination affect every racial and ethnic group.

Feelings About Immigrants

Another key aspect of racial and ethnic perception concerns questions of immigration and acculturation. We sought to determine whether different groups see immigrants as a positive or negative influence on society. We also explored any cleavages that might exist between those who advocate the traditional "melting pot" concept of assimilation and those who wish to preserve their distinct cultural traditions.

In order to determine the impact of these questions on intergroup relations, we asked the students whether they believe America owes a great deal to immigrants. As Table 9 illustrates, there is considerable diversity of opinion, and no simple racial split. Blacks are the least likely and Asians the most likely to credit the immigrant's contribution. Such results should not be surprising. Our shameful heritage of slavery deprived Blacks of the traditional immigrant experience. Asian Americans, the newest immigrants, probably feel that experience most intensely. Roughly half of all Hispanic, Jewish, and Irish American students believe that the immigrants contributed much to this country. Among Italian American students, a plurality of 41 percent holds this position.

When we asked if foreigners who come to live here should give up their foreign ways and learn to live like other Americans, we found some of the most dramatic ethnic differences in the survey. These findings

are shown in Table 10. Blacks, Jews, Hispanics, and Asians, in particular, reject the notion of thoroughgoing assimilation. Conversely, Irish and (to a lesser extent) Italian students feel that foreigners should assimilate. The newer immigrants are undoubtedly still struggling with reconciling American ways and their own cultures. Similarly, Blacks may reject assimilation as a threat to their distinct cultural and racial identity. In any case, the question of immigration and assimilation is a divisive one, and response to questions on these issues reflect no consistent racial alliances or cleavages.

In Conclusion

The results of the survey suggest that the parameters of ethnic and racial prejudice are broad enough to encompass many different groups. On the positive side, the survey uncovered a combination of expressed tolerance with lower levels of negative stereotyping. We found that large majorities of all white groups report that neither they nor their parents discourage contacts with nonwhites. Nonwhite groups are even more open to association with various white ethnic groups.

While students report a surprisingly high perception of tolerance in their home environment, in school, many students in the study perceive the existence of racial and ethnic problems. This finding suggests that it is not sufficient to simply bring different groups together and hope for the best. Rather, we must increase our efforts and continue to teach and promote harmony from a multi-ethnic approach.

The need for such an approach is underscored by the racial and ethnic stereotypes held by the students. One of our most striking findings is that the school's three largest groups--Italians, blacks, and Hispanics--elicit the highest rates of negative stereotyping. This finding suggests that negative stereotypes cannot be explained simply by racism, and that we must take the "ethnic presence" factor into account.

Despite this negative stereotyping, only a minority in each group ascribes negative traits to any other group. Thus, notwithstanding some troublesome pockets of intolerance and negative stereotyping, we find no dominant pattern of overt racial and ethnic prejudice at Adams.

The survey also shows that perceived discrimination is not simply a Black/White issue. It appears to be more multifaceted. Students of Asian ancestry are more likely to report an incident of discrimination (56%). They are followed by Jews and Blacks (just under half of these groups report discrimination). Likewise, there is no simple Black/White split on attitudes toward immigration and assimilation.

These findings demonstrate no consistent pattern of racial cleavages. Prejudice is not that simple. Indeed, it never was. We all know that widespread racism existed in the country at the turn of the century. But discrimination against immigrants by native-born Americans does not tell the entire story. There was more than a little enmity between German and Italian Saloon keepers on the Bowery. There was also

trouble between members of the same ethnic group. Many Victorian housewives learned that hiring an Irish parlormaid from an "unacceptable" town might mean the mass departure of her other Irish servants. Would anyone claim that racial and ethnic relations have grown simpler since that time?

While any incident of racism must be deplored and its causes confronted, we should also remember that over the past three decades, the country has become more racially tolerant. Many polls, such as those conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, show an impressive rise in support for everything from integrating schools and neighborhoods to consorting at social clubs with members of other racial groups. This trend does not mean racism has been eliminated. But it does mean that important progress has been made. Equally important, it shows that further progress can be made.

The opinions of John Adams students show considerable racial tolerance coupled with some racial tension and lingering pockets of prejudice. This constellation of attitudes has the potential to be turned in a positive or negative direction. It can be used to enflame racial animosity, or it can be a focus for engaging in constructive debates and activities to promote racial and ethnic understanding.

We will never achieve such understanding until we fully avail ourselves of peripheral vision. Prejudice is complex, not dichotomous. All of its elements--color, culture, behavior, and religion--must be

explored. In a multiethnic and multiracial society, we can afford nothing less than the total truth.

6877-(NAD-4)

5/11/87-EL

Table 1. Percent Willing to Invite Other Group Member Home

(percent)

Group Responding	Group Rated					
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish
Asian	(94)	83	89	91	94	91
Black	90	(94)	95	92	95	93
Hispanic	90	91	(94)	91	96	95
Jewish	88	88	84	(100)	100	98
Italian	79	71	82	91	(97)	98
Irish	69	69	79	96	96	(98)
Other	92	84	90	91	93	95
ALL	87	85	89	92	96	95

Table 2. Percent Whose Parents Do Not Discourage Contact with Other Groups

(percent)

Group Responding	Group Rated					
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish
Asian	(91)	83	77	91	94	91
Black	95	(93)	95	94	95	95
Hispanic	98	93	(91)	98	95	99
Jewish	96	92	96	(98)	96	96
Italian	91	77	85	96	(97)	98
Irish	89	84	82	93	96	(98)
Other	96	84	93	95	95	99
ALL	94	87	91	95	96	97

Table 3. Do Different Groups Get Together at School?
(percent)

Response	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish	Other	Total
Yes	35	50	47	48	29	23	39	41
No	18	23	25	28	46	41	27	30
Unsure	47	27	28	24	25	36	34	29
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	34	305	215	50	251	44	164	1,063

Table 4. Has There Been Trouble at School?
(percent)

Response	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish	Other	Total
Yes	42	49	55	64	63	60	59	56
No	15	26	23	20	19	18	18	21
Unsure	42	25	22	16	18	22	24	23
	99*	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	33	308	210	50	250	45	159	1,055

*Does not sum to 100 percent due to rounding error.

Table 5. Percent Applying Negative Imagery to Racial and Ethnic Groups

(percent)

Group Responding	Group Rated						
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish	(N)
Asian	(09)[1]	35	36	06	28	12	35
Black	17	(31)	28	18	33	16	318
Hispanic	16	29	(20)	16	37	17	221
Jewish	16	36	35	(16)	39	19	50
Italian	18	41	37	15	(25)	17	257
Irish	17	29	32	16	20	(14)	45
Other	18	35	29	17	25	16	167
All[2]	17	35	29	16	32	16	

1. Parentheses indicate ratings of one's own group.

2. Excludes members of group being rated.

Table 6. Percent Applying Positive Imagery to Racial and Ethnic Groups

(percent)

Group Responding	Group Rated					
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish
Asian	(54)[1]	16	15	33	29	28
Black	26	(46)	30	30	34	27
Hispanic	22	26	(51)	27	34	24
Jewish	35	26	23	(70)	44	34
Italian	24	18	20	39	(70)	42
Irish	19	10	14	28	44	(55)
Others	30	25	28	36	41	34
All[2]	26	22	25	32	36	31

1. Parentheses indicate ratings of one's own group.

2. Excludes members of group being rated.

Table 7. Percent Applying Aggressive Imagery to Racial and Ethnic Groups

(percent)

Group Responding	Group Rated	
	Blacks	Hispanics
Asian	60	49
Black	(61)[1]	43
Hispanic	59	(44)
Jewish	68	60
Italian	62	55
Irish	59	42
Other	55	42
All[2]	60	47

1. Parentheses indicate ratings of one's own group.

2. Excludes members of group being rated.

Table 8. Have You Experienced Discrimination?

(percent)

Response	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish	Other	Total
Yes	56	45	37	46	20	18	33	33
No	35	43	50	52	74	73	56	56
Unsure	9	12	13	2	6	9	11	11
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	34	304	214	48	251	45	158	1,054

Table 9. Does U.S.A. Owe Much to Immigrants?
(percent)

Response	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish	Other	Total
Agree	59	36	50	53	41	49	45	43
Disagree	21	35	19	37	35	37	23	30
Unsure	21	29	31	10	24	14	32	27
	101*	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	34	304	208	49	251	43	160	1,049

*Does not sum to 100 percent due to rounding error.

Table 10. Immigrants Should Assimilate

(percent)

Response	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Jewish	Italian	Irish	Other	Total
Agree	12	20	17	29	46	58	29	29
Disagree	73	64	68	56	40	31	60	57
Unsure	15	16	16	15	14	11	11	14
	100	100	101*	100	100	100	100	100
N	34	304	205	48	248	45	161	1,045

*Does not sum to 100 percent due to rounding error.

Figure 1. Adjectives Used in Group Image Scales

Positive

All groups: friendly, honest, polite, hardworking, smart, kind, emotional, religious

Asian, Hispanics, and Irish: add family-oriented

Black: add rich, powerful, family-oriented

Negative

All groups: lazy, snobbish, stupid, selfish

Asian, Jewish: add violent, heavy drinkers, criminal, loud

Italian: add heavy drinkers, criminal, pushy

Irish: add loud, criminal, flashy

Aggressive

Hispanic: violent, criminal, loud, pushy

Black: violent, criminal, loud, athletic, musical

Note: These scales were created from factor analyses of 24 adjectives. Analyses were conducted separately for ratings of each group. Adjectives selected loaded at least .45 on factors generated by the principal axis method with varimax rotation.